

Application No. 10/777,990
Response dated: December 16, 2005
Reply to Final Office action dated: October 17, 2005

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated October 17, 2005, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration based on the above claim amendments and the following remarks. Applicant respectfully submits that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance.

Claims 1-4 and 6-23 are pending in the present Application. Claims 1-9 and 21-23 have been cancelled and Claims 10, 12 and 18 have been amended, leaving Claims 10-20 for consideration upon entry of the present amendments and following remarks.

Support for the claim amendments can at least be found in the specification, the figures, and the claims as originally filed. Particularly, support for amended Claims 10 and 18 is at least be found in originally filed specification at page 5, lines 14 and 15 and Figure 1.

No new matter has been introduced by these amendments. Reconsideration and allowance of the claims are respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

The drawings received August 04, 2005 were accepted.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 10-17 and 21-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the written description requirement because claims contain subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors at the time of the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Claims 21-23 are hereinabove cancelled without prejudice and rejections are therefore rendered moot for these claims.

In Claim 10, lines 7 and 8, “the driving part has a plurality of first switching devices formed on the lower substrate” is not supported by the original specification. Claim 10 is hereinabove amended to delete “the driving part has a plurality of first switching devices formed on the lower substrate” from the claim.

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the relevant rejections is respectfully requested.

Application No. 10/777,990
Response dated: December 16, 2005
Reply to Final Office action dated: October 17, 2005

Claim Objections

Claims 12 and 21 are objected to because of various informalities. As discussed above, Claim 21 is hereinabove cancelled.

In Claim 12, line 1, "an end portions" should be "end portions." Applicant thanks the Examiner for suggested language and hereinabove amends Claim 12 accordingly. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the relevant claim objection is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102

Regarding Claims 1-4, 6, 7, 9 and 21

Claims 1-4, 6, 7, 9 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Shimada et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,576,730. Claims 1-4, 6, 7, 9 and 21 are hereinabove canceled without prejudice and rejections are therefore rendered moot for these claims.

Regarding Claims 10-20 and 23

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. V. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

Claims 10-20 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Kim, U.S. Patent No. 6,781,403 (hereinafter "Kim"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections. Claim 23 is hereinabove canceled without prejudice and rejections are therefore rendered moot for this claim.

Applicant has amended independent Claims 10 and 18 to recite, *inter alia*,

"a driving part formed at the lower substrate and outputting a second inspection signal in response to the first inspection signal provided through the inspection line."

The explanation in the Office Action cites lower substrate 2, Log-type signal line group 26 and gate drive IC 16 of Kim as disclosing the lower substrate, inspection line and driving part of the claimed invention.

Kim discloses gate driver IC's 16 mounted in the gate tape carrier packages (TCP's) 14 and the Log-type signal line group 26 positioned on the lower substrate 2. (Col. 2, lines 29-51

Application No. 10/777,990
Response dated: December 16, 2005
Reply to Final Office action dated: October 17, 2005

and Figures 1 and 2.) In describing Figure 1 and a thin film transistor array process of the lower substrate 2, the Log-type signal line group 26 is disclosed as being formed simultaneously with the gate lines 20 on the lower substrate. (Col. 3, lines 15-30 and Figure 2.) The gate TCP 14 supports a gate driver IC 16 and is provided with a gate driving signal transmission line group 28 electrically connected to the gate drive IC 16 and output pads 30. (Col. 3, lines 1-8 and Figures 1 and 2.) The gate driving transmission signal line group 28 is then connected to the LOG-type signal line group 26 on the lower substrate 2, while the output pads 30 are electrically connected to the gate pads on the lower substrate 2. (*Id.*)

That is, the gate driver IC 16 is connected to the lower substrate 2 *through* a TCP 14. The gate driver IC 16 is not *formed at* the lower substrate, but at best is formed on the gate TCP 14. Therefore, Kim does not disclose at least a driving part formed at the lower substrate and outputting a second inspection signal in response to the first inspection signal provided through the inspection line as recited in amended Claims 10 and 18.

It is respectfully stated in the Office Action at Page 10, that "it is *believed* that the gate driver IC *could be mounted* on the TCP or alternatively mounted on to the lower substrate. Missing elements may not be supplied by the knowledge of one skilled in the art or the disclosure of another reference. *Titanium Metals Corp. v. Banner*, 778 F.2d 775, 780, 227 U.S.P.Q. 773, 777 (Fed. Cir. 1985). As discussed above, Kim does not disclose a driving part formed at the lower substrate and *believing* that a feature *could be taught* by a reference does not fulfill the requirements of anticipation under 35 U.S.C. §102.

Thus, for all the reasons stated above, Kim does not disclose all of the limitations of at least amended Claims 10 and 18. Accordingly, Kim does not anticipate amended Claims 10 and 18. Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 10 and 18 are not further rejected or objected and are therefore allowable. As Claims 11-17, 19 and 20 variously depend from Claims 10 and 18, they are thus correspondingly allowable. Reconsideration and allowance of Claims 10-20 is respectfully requested.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 8 and 22 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim

Application No. 10/777,990
Response dated: December 16, 2005
Reply to Final Office action dated: October 17, 2005

and any intervening claims. Applicant gratefully acknowledges the Examiner's noting the allowable subject matter in Claims 8 and 22, but Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 8 and 22 have been hereinabove cancelled without prejudice.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the instant application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this application be allowed and a Notice of Allowance issued. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference with Applicant's attorneys would be advantageous to the disposition of this case, the Examiner is cordially requested to telephone the undersigned.

In the event the Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks deems additional fees to be due in connection with this application, Applicant's attorney hereby authorizes that such fee be charged to Deposit Account No. 06-1130.

Respectfully submitted,

CANTOR COLBURN LLP

By: 

Jae Y. PARK
Ltd. Recognition No. L0077
CANTOR COLBURN LLP
55 Griffin Road South
Bloomfield, CT 06002
Telephone (860) 286-2929
Facsimile (860) 286-0115

Date: December 16, 2005